



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/885,984	06/20/2001	David R. Daniels	P00,1904	6954
26574	7590	05/28/2004	EXAMINER	
SCHIFF HARDIN, LLP PATENT DEPARTMENT 6600 SEARS TOWER CHICAGO, IL 60606-6473			SELF, SHELLEY M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3725	

DATE MAILED: 05/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

CS

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/885,984	DANIELS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Shelley Self	3725	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6,7,11,12 and 14-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6,7,11,12 and 14-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 June 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 12, 2004 has been entered.

Drawings

New corrected drawings for figures 1-7 are required in this application because hash markings and lettering/numbering are not clear and legible. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6, 7, 11, 12, 14-17, 19, 21-24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rice et al. (4,884,640) in view of Engler, III et al. (5,452,751). With regard to claims 6, 7, 11 and 12, Rice discloses a router table comprising a support connected to a

Art Unit: 3725

tabletop the tabletop defining at least three groups of hole patterns for mounting routers. Rice does not disclose each group having different hole center distance and at least two groups having different radial hole center distances. Engler teaches a mounting plate for mounting a router to a table top wherein there are a plurality of different hole patterns (20, 22) having differing radial hole center distances for mounting router having different footprints (fig. 2). Because the references are from a similar art and deal with a similar problem, i.e. mounting routers to a table top to create a precision router table, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one having ordinary skill in the art to replace Rice's table top mounting plate with a mounting plate having different hole patterns with different radial distances so as to mount routers having different footprints, as taught by Engler.

As to the at least hole patterns, Engler does not teach three hole patterns, Engler does however teach two hole patterns, it would have obvious at the time of the invention to one having ordinary skill in the art to have any number of hole pattern groups since the mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art and creates no unobvious, unusual or unexpected result. See *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

With regard to claims 14, 15, 21 and 22, Balolia discloses a plurality of vertical support legs.

With regard to claims 16 and 23 Rice discloses a guide channel (22).

With regard to claim 17 and 24, Rice discloses a fence (74) slidably positioned on the work surface.

With regard to claims 19 and 26, Rice discloses a mitre guide (44, 48; figs. 3, 4).

Claims 18 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rice et al. (4,884,6404) in view of Engler, III et al. (5,452,751) as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Jaksha (5,367,933). Rice does not disclose a feather flap. Jaksha teaches the use of a feather flap constructed of a resilient material (col. 2, lines 24-26). Jaksha teaches this construction to hold the workpiece(s). Because the references are from a similar art and deal with a similar problem (i.e. holding the work piece) it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide, Rice with a flap as taught by Jaksha to hold the work piece.

Claims 20 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rice et al. (4,884,6404) in view of Engler, III et al. (5,452,751) as applied to claims 6 and 11 above, and further in view of Fukuda (5,868,188). Rice does not disclose a safety shield. Fukuda teaches that it is old and well known to use a safety shield when operating/using a router. Fukuda teaches the use of a transparent safety shield (100) placed over a router hole (606) so as to improve safety when operating a router. Because the references are from a similar art, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide Rice with a safety shield positioned over the router for improved safety as taught by Fukuda.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shelley Self whose telephone number is (703) 305-5299. The examiner can normally be reached Mon-Fri from 8:30am to 5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's Supervisor, Allen Ostrager can be reached at (703) 308-3136. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular and After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

SSelf
May 26, 2004



**ALLEN OSTRAGER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700**